
Notice of Independent Medical Review Determination

Dated: 11/6/2013

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Employee:

Claim Number:

Date of UR Decision:

Date of Injury:

IMR Application Received:

MAXIMUS Case Number:

[REDACTED]

7/23/2013

5/1/2013

8/6/2013

CM13-0007415

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for Percocet 10/325mg #240 **is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW DECISION AND RATIONALE

An application for Independent Medical Review was filed on 8/6/2013 disputing the Utilization Review Denial dated 7/23/2013. A Notice of Assignment and Request for Information was provided to the above parties on 9/6/2013. A decision has been made for each of the treatment and/or services that were in dispute:

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the request for Percocet 10/325mg #240 **is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

Medical Qualifications of the Expert Reviewer:

The Medical Doctor who made the decision has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine, and is licensed to practice in California. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The Expert Reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and treatments and/or services at issue.

Case Summary:

Disclaimer: The utilization review determination did not contain a clinical summary.

Documents Reviewed for Determination:

The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:

- Application for Independent Medical Review (received 8/6/2013)
- Utilization Review Determination from [REDACTED]
- No medical records were provided timely by the Claim Administrator
- Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS)

1) **Regarding the request for Percocet 10/325mg #240:**

Medical Treatment Guideline(s) Relied Upon by the Expert Reviewer to Make His/Her Decision:

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines (2009), which is part of the California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS).

The Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines (2009), which is part of the California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS).

Rationale for the Decision:

The employee sustained a work-related injury on 05/01/13. The request is for Percocet 10/325mg #240.

Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that for continuation of opioids, there must be a return to work or documentation that function has improved or pain has improved. Medical records submitted and reviewed indicate the employee has had total knee revision/arthoplasty in April 2012, and is starting PT due to quadriceps weakness. There is no documentation of functional improvement or pain reduction with the medication. The guideline criteria have not been met. The request for Percocet 10/325mg #240 is not medically necessary and appropriate.

Effect of the Decision:

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the final determination of the Administrative Director, Division of Workers' Compensation. With respect to the medical necessity of the treatment in dispute, this determination is binding on all parties.

In accordance with California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h), a determination of the administrative director may be reviewed only if a verified appeal is filed with the appeals board for hearing and served on all interested parties within 30 days of the date of mailing of the determination to the employee or the employer. The determination of the administrative director shall be presumed to be correct and shall be set aside only upon proof by clear and convincing evidence of one or more of the grounds for appeal listed in Labor Code Section 4610.6(h)(1) through (5).

Sincerely;

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations
Division of Workers' Compensation
1515 Clay Street, 18th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

/reg

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.